UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/557,738	04/25/2000	KEVIN B. GJERSTAD	1018.097US1	9935

5251 7590 04/14/2004

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON LLP
2555 GRAND BLVD
KANSAS CITY,, MO 64108

EXAMINER	
SMITH, PETER J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	8

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/557,738	GJERSTAD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Peter J Smith	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 February 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *25 April 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: request for reconsideration filed on 2/9/2004, application filed on 4/25/2000.

2. Claims 1-22 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 7, 14, and 20 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 3-4, 7-8, and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Saunders, US 5,946,499 filed 05/10/1996.

Regarding independent claim 1, Saunders discloses a text store interface to permit an application having a document of primarily text to expose the document as an abstraction in fig. 1, 2, 5, col. 2 lines 6-16, col. 3 lines 53-65, and col. 6 line 39 - col. 7 line 44. Saunders discloses a text input processor interface to permit a handler for an input device to access the abstraction of the document and to insert additional text into the document in fig. 4a, 4b, 5, col. 1 line 55- col. 2 line 29, col. 4 line 59 – col. 5 line 9, and col. 6 line 39 - col. 7 line 44.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Saunders discloses a range object in which a range within the document is specified as two positions within the abstraction of the document, such

that the handler inserts the additional text into the document and accesses the abstraction of the document at the range specified by the range object in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 44.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Saunders discloses insertion accomplished via a first method of a text input processor interface, and access is accomplished via a second method of a text input processor interface in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 44.

Regarding independent claim 7, Saunders discloses a plurality of applications, each application having a document of primarily text in fig. 1, 4a, and 4b. Saunders discloses a plurality of input device handlers, each handler having a corresponding input device in fig. 1 and col. 1 lines 55-65. Saunders discloses a framework designed to permit each application to expose a document as an abstraction, and to permit each handler to access the abstraction of the document of each application and to insert additional text into the document of each application in fig. 1, 2, and col. 1 lines 55-65.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Saunders discloses a text store interface to permit an application having a document of primarily text to expose the document as an abstraction in fig. 1, 2, 5, col. 2 lines 6-16, col. 3 lines 53-65, and col. 6 line 39 - col. 7 line 44. Saunders discloses a text input processor interface to permit a handler for an input device to access the abstraction of the document and to insert additional text into the document in fig. 4a, 4b, 5, col. 1 line 55- col. 2 line 29, col. 4 line 59 – col. 5 line 9, and col. 6 line 39 - col. 7 line 44.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Saunders discloses a range object in which a range within the document is specified as two positions within the abstraction of the document, such that the handler inserts the additional text into the document and accesses the abstraction of the document at the range specified by the range object in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 44.

Regarding dependent claim 11, Saunders discloses insertion accomplished via a first method of a text input processor interface, and access is accomplished via a second method of a text input processor interface in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 44.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2, 9, and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saunders, US 5,946,499 filed 05/10/1996 in view of Tung et al. (hereafter referred to as Tung), US 5,511,193 published 04/23/1996.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Saunders teaches a text stream interface in which the abstraction of the document appears as an array, a position within the document represented as an offset from a beginning of the array in fig. 1, 4a, 4b, and col. 7 lines 18-32. Saunders also teaches an application which selects at least one of the text stream interface and the dynamic text interface by which to expose the document as an abstraction in fig. 1, 2, and col. 1 lines 55-65. Saunders teaches a tree structure for organizing the document content in fig. 3, but does not teach a dynamic text interface in which the abstraction of the document is such that a position within a document represented as a floating anchor to a node.

Tung does teach a dynamic text interface in which the abstraction of the document is such that a position within a document represented as a floating anchor to a node in col. 7 lines

16-18. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Tung into Saunders to create the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the dynamic text interface taught by Tung to have improved Saunders so that the common text framework could have accommodated a larger variety of application documents.

Regarding dependent claim 9, Saunders teaches a text stream interface in which the abstraction of the document appears as an array, a position within the document represented as an offset from a beginning of the array in fig. 1, 4a, 4b, and col. 7 lines 18-32. Saunders also teaches an application which selects at least one of the text stream interface and the dynamic text interface by which to expose the document as an abstraction in fig. 1, 2, and col. 1 lines 55-65. Saunders teaches a tree structure for organizing the document content in fig. 3, but does not teach a dynamic text interface in which the abstraction of the document is such that a position within a document represented as a floating anchor to a node.

Tung does teach a dynamic text interface in which the abstraction of the document is such that a position within a document represented as a floating anchor to a node in col. 7 lines 16-18. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Tung into Saunders to create the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the dynamic text interface taught by Tung to have improved Saunders so that the common text framework could have accommodated a larger variety of application documents.

Regarding independent claim 14, Saunders teaches a text store interface to permit an application having a document of primarily text to expose the document as an abstraction in fig.

1, 2, 5, col. 2 lines 6-16, col. 3 lines 53-65, and col. 6 line 39 - col. 7 line 44. Saunders teaches a text stream interface in which the abstraction of the document appears as an array, a position within the document represented as an offset from a beginning of the array in fig. 1, 4a, 4b, and col. 7 lines 18-32. Saunders also teaches an application which selects at least one of the text stream interface and the dynamic text interface by which to expose the document as an abstraction in fig. 1, 2, and col. 1 lines 55-65. Saunders teaches a tree structure for organizing the document content in fig. 3, but does not teach a dynamic text interface in which the abstraction of the document is such that a position within a document represented as a floating anchor to a node.

Tung does teach a dynamic text interface in which the abstraction of the document is such that a position within a document represented as a floating anchor to a node in col. 7 lines 16-18. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Tung into Saunders to create the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the dynamic text interface taught by Tung to have improved Saunders so that the common text framework could have accommodated a larger variety of application documents.

Regarding dependent claim 15, Saunders teaches a text input processor interface to permit a handler for an input device to access the abstraction of the document and to insert additional text into the document in fig. 4a, 4b, 5, col. 1 line 55- col. 2 line 29, col. 4 line 59 – col. 5 line 9, and col. 6 line 39 - col. 7 line 44.

Regarding dependent claim 16, Saunders teaches a range object in which a range within the document is specified as two positions within the abstraction of the document, such that the

handler inserts the additional text into the document and accesses the abstraction of the document at the range specified by the range object in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 44.

Regarding dependent claim 17, Saunders teaches insertion accomplished via a first method of a text input processor interface, and access is accomplished via a second method of a text input processor interface in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 44.

7. Claims 5-6, 12-13, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saunders, US 5,946,499 filed 05/10/1996 in view of Covington et al. (hereafter referred to as Covington), US 5,524,193 published 06/04/1996.

Regarding dependent claims 5 and 6, Saunders teaches selecting a range specified by a range object in fig. 5 and implementing linguistic or stylistic aid functions via a method of a text input processor interface in col. 2 lines 42-45. Saunders does not teach wherein the handler for the input device is permitted to attach a property to the document at a specified range. Covington teach wherein the handler for the input device is permitted to attach a property to the document at a specified range in the abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Covington into Saunders to create the invention as claimed. It would have been obvious and desirable to incorporate the ability of attaching properties to sections of text so that the user could make and attach various aids to better understand the text of the document. This would have made the invention more useful to the computer user.

Regarding dependent claims 12 and 13, Saunders teaches selecting a range specified by a range object in fig. 5 and implementing linguistic or stylistic aid functions via a method of a

text input processor interface in col. 2 lines 42-45. Saunders does not teach wherein the handler for the input device is permitted to attach a property to the document at a specified range. Covington teach wherein the handler for the input device is permitted to attach a property to the document at a specified range in the abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Covington into Saunders to create the invention as claimed. It would have been obvious and desirable to incorporate the ability of attaching properties to sections of text so that the user could make and attach various aids to better understand the text of the document. This would have made the invention more useful to the computer user.

Regarding independent claim 20, Saunders teaches a text input processor interface to permit a handler for an input device to access the abstraction of the document and to insert additional text into the document in fig. 4a, 4b, 5, col. 1 line 55- col. 2 line 29, col. 4 line 59 – col. 5 line 9, and col. 6 line 39 - col. 7 line 44. Saunders teaches a range object in which a range within the document is specified as two positions within the abstraction of the document, such that the handler inserts the additional text into the document and accesses the abstraction of the document at the range specified by the range object in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 44. Saunders teaches insertion accomplished via a first method of a text input processor interface, and access is accomplished via a second method of a text input processor interface in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 44.

Saunders teaches selecting a range specified by a range object in fig. 5 and implementing linguistic or stylistic aid functions via a method of a text input processor interface in col. 2 lines 42-45. Saunders does not teach wherein the handler for the input device is permitted to attach a

property to the document at a specified range. Covington teaches wherein the handler for the input device is permitted to attach a property to the document at a specified range in the abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Covington into Saunders to create the invention as claimed. It would have been obvious and desirable to incorporate the ability of attaching properties to sections of text so that the user could make and attach various aids to better understand the text of the document. This would have made the invention more useful to the computer user.

Regarding dependent claim 21, Saunders discloses a text store interface to permit an application having a document of primarily text to expose the document as an abstraction in fig. 1, 2, 5, col. 2 lines 6-16, col. 3 lines 53-65, and col. 6 line 39 - col. 7 line 44.

8. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saunders, US 5,946,499 filed 05/10/1996 in view of Tung et al. (hereafter referred to as Tung), US 5,511,193 published 04/23/1996 as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Covington et al. (hereafter referred to as Covington), US 5,524,193 published 06/04/1996.

Regarding dependent claims 18 and 19, Saunders teaches selecting a range specified by a range object in fig. 5 and implementing linguistic or stylistic aid functions via a method of a text input processor interface in col. 2 lines 42-45. Saunders does not teach wherein the handler for the input device is permitted to attach a property to the document at a specified range. Covington teach wherein the handler for the input device is permitted to attach a property to the document at a specified range in the abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Covington into Saunders to create the invention as claimed. It would have been obvious and desirable to incorporate the ability of attaching properties to sections of text so that the user could make and attach various aids to better understand the text of the document. This would have made the invention more useful to the computer user.

9. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saunders, US 5,946,499 filed 05/10/1996 in view of Covington et al. (hereafter referred to as Covington), US 5,524,193 published 06/04/1996 as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Tung et al. (hereafter referred to as Tung), US 5,511,193 published 04/23/1996.

Regarding dependent claim 22, Saunders teaches a text stream interface in which the abstraction of the document appears as an array, a position within the document represented as an offset from a beginning of the array in fig. 1, 4a, 4b, and col. 7 lines 18-32. Saunders also teaches an application which selects at least one of the text stream interface and the dynamic text interface by which to expose the document as an abstraction in fig. 1, 2, and col. 1 lines 55-65. Saunders does not teach a dynamic text interface in which the abstraction of the document is such that a position within a document represented as a floating anchor to a node.

Tung does teach a dynamic text interface in which the abstraction of the document is such that a position within a document represented as a floating anchor to a node in col. 7 lines 16-18. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Tung into Saunders to create the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the dynamic text interface taught by Tung to have

improved Saunders so that the common text framework could have accommodated a larger variety of application documents.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 2/9/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding Applicant's argument on pages 2 and 3 that Saunders does not teach exposing a document of primarily text as an abstraction or permitting a handler for an input device to access the abstraction of the document as required by independent claims 1 and 7, the Examiner believes Saunders does disclose this. The Examiner's interpretation of exposing an abstraction is defining a sub-portion of the document to which text may entered and manipulated through use of one of the plurality of handlers. Saunders discloses defining a selected portion of the document and subsequently entering or manipulating text within the selected portion in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 44. The Examiner believes the selected portion of the document is an exposed abstraction which is then is accessed by one of the plurality of handlers through the text services manager.

Regarding Applicant's argument on page 4 that neither Saunders or Tung teaches or discloses a dynamic text interface in which an abstraction of a document is such that a position within the document is represented as a floating anchor to a node. Tung does teach the use of floating input window flags, which the Examiner believes are the equivalent of the floating anchor of the claimed invention, to represent the position within the abstraction. Furthermore, Saunders does teach marking a range within the document in col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 44. The Examiner believes it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to have combined Tung into Saunders to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the floating flags so that the represented position could have been easily manipulated by the user.

Regarding Applicant's argument on page 5 that Covington fails to teach inserting addition text into the document and to access the abstraction of the document as required by independent claim 20. The Examiner does not rely on Covington to teach this limitation and instead relies on Saunders. The Examiner's interpretation of exposing an abstraction is defining a sub-portion of the document to which text may entered and manipulated through use of one of the plurality of handlers. Saunders discloses defining a selected portion of the document and subsequently entering or manipulating text within the selected portion in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 44. The Examiner believes the selected portion of the document is an exposed abstraction which is then is accessed for text addition and manipulation by one of the plurality of handlers through the text services manager. Covington teaches wherein the handler for the input device is permitted to attach a property to the document at a specified range in the abstract.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J Smith whose telephone number is 703-305-5931. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 703-305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS
April 7, 2004

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER